

## **REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the FINAL Office Action mailed February 20, 2008.

Claims 1-20 and 23-37 are pending in the present application.

Applicant had a brief telephone conference with the Examiner on April 21, 2008 to discuss the current rejections related to Claim 1 and other Claims depending from Claim 1.

Applicant discussed with the Examiner that Applicant had made an error in the previous amendment to Claim 1 – wherein Applicant accidentally made the wrong deletion to a subpixel repeating group.

With the present amendment to Claim 1, Applicant believes that the current rejection to Claim 1 and all dependent Claims have now been overcome.

### **Claim Objections:**

The Examiner objects to Claims 1 and 10 for the following informalities:

As for Claim 1, line 5, the Examiner finds that “;” should be changed to “,” and in line 14, “;” should be appended to the end of the line.

As for Claim 10, line 2, the Examiner finds that “temperature” should be changed to “color temperature”.

Applicant avers that the current amendment to Claims 1 and 10 have corrected the noted informalities.

### **Claim Rejection Under 35 USC 103:**

#### **Claims 1, 4, 6, 10 and 11:**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 4, 6, 10 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Number US 2004/0195963 (hereinafter “Choi”).

Specifically, as to Claim 1, the Examiner finds that Choi teaches a display (OLED display; fig. 2) substantially comprising one of a first group, said grouping comprising:

R B G

G W R

wherein W is substantially white, G is substantially green, R is substantially red, and B is substantially blue (see Fig. 3C and page 4, paragraph 42; the 2x3 lattice uses two reds, two greens, one blue and one white subpixels).

As explained above, Applicant amends Claim 1 to correct an error made during the last amendment to Claim 1.

As discussed with the Examiner in the telephone conference of April 21, 2008, Applicant respectfully avers that the present rejection has now been overcome.

As for Claims 4, 6, 10 and 11, Applicant avers that the present amendment to Claim 1 has removed the rejections as to these Claims as well.

Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1, 4, 6, 10 and 11 be moved through to allowance.

Claims 2, 8, 9, 20 and 23-24:

The Examiner rejects 2, 8, 9, 20 and 23-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of United States Patent Number 5,757,452 (hereinafter "Masaki").

Applicant respectfully avers that the present amendment to Claim 1 has now mooted the rejection to Claims 2, 8, 9 20 and 23-24 above.

Applicant requests that Claims 2, 8, 9, 20 and 23-24 now be moved to allowance.

Claim 7:

The Examiner rejects Claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi as applied to Claim 1 above and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,914,649 (hereinafter "Liu").

Applicant respectfully avers that the current amendment to Claim 1 moots the current rejection to Claim 7 – as Claim 7 depends from Claim 1.

Applicant requests that Claim 7 be moved through to allowance.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing reasons, all Claims, pending after this amendment, are now in condition for allowance. Please telephone the undersigned attorney at (408) 392-9250 if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2008

By: Stuart P. Kaler  
Stuart P. Kaler  
Reg. No. 35,913  
Attorney for Applicants

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP  
2033 Gateway Place, Suite 400  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Telephone: (408) 392-9250  
Fax: (408) 392-9262

<b>FILED VIA EFS</b> <b>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</b>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic filing system on April 21, 2008.	
<u>Stuart P. Kaler</u> Stuart P. Kaler Attorney for Applicant(s)	<u>21 Apr 08</u> Date of Signature